

# Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2007-10/msg00306.html>

---

- *From:* oriel36 <geraldkelleher@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Wed, 10 Oct 2007 09:36:13 -0700
- 

On Oct 10, 1:53 am, Quadibloc <jsav...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

oriel36 wrote:

The variations in luminosity as the Earth approaches and overtakes a planet can be seen in the text and by observation \*,as a follower of the false approach by Newton using a hypothetical observer on the Sun you cannot find these lovely arguments.

If one accepts the "simple annual motion of the Earth", then one accepts that it is the Sun that is the body in the Solar System that has no motion except the general motion of the Solar System as a whole.

Does that not make that viewpoint, then, the proper viewpoint from which to consider the motions of the Solar System, because that is the viewpoint from which the complexities of the geocentric approach are banished, and everything is made plain?

Galileo had much to say about your kind,the difference being that unfortunately it is now almost the totally dominant viewpoint ,it is crude,it is brutish and the contrapunctal opposite of all things astronomical.Even with the text of Galileo before you

SALV. "The same thing has struck me even more forcibly than you. I have heard such things put forth as I should blush to repeat--not so much to avoid discrediting their authors (whose names could always be withheld) as to refrain from detracting so greatly from the honor of the human race. In the long run my observations have convinced me that some men, reasoning preposterously, first establish some conclusion in their minds which, either because of its being their own or because of their having received it from some person who has their entire confidence, impresses them so deeply that one finds it impossible ever to get it out of their heads. Such arguments in support of their fixed idea as they hit upon themselves or hear set forth by others, no matter how simple and stupid these may be, gain their instant

## Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

acceptance and applause. On the other hand whatever is brought forward against it, however ingenious and conclusive, they receive with disdain or with hot rage—if indeed it does not make them ill. Beside themselves with passion, some of them would not be backward even about scheming to suppress and silence their adversaries. I have had some experience of this myself."

<http://webexhibits.org/calendars/year-text-Galileo.html>

You have establish the conclusion that retrogrades a resolved from the standpoint of a hypothetical observer on the Sun when this is a false conclusion and has no astronomical pedigree –

" For to the earth planetary motions appear sometimes direct, sometimes stationary, nay, and sometimes retrograde. But from the sun they are always seen direct," Newton

There is no exasperation that the text of Galileo goes the same way as Huygens in timekeeping astronomy and Kepler and Copernicus in structural astronomy, in the words of Galileo –

"On the other hand whatever is brought forward against it, however ingenious and conclusive, they receive with disdain—or if indeed it does not make them ill. " Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems,

It is unclear to me not merely what you object to, but how you come to object to it. You seem to find the motions of the Solar System dull and lifeless when the mathematical clutter of subtracting out and then adding back in the motions of the Earth no longer has to be repeated incessantly. I suppose for someone who appreciates the Solar System by intuition, and is not doing the work with figures, that is a tenable position. To working positional astronomers – it would be a bad joke.

You do not disgrace yourself as an astrologer for as far as you are concerned it is a legitimate view. If you see a star return in 23 hours 56 minutes 04 seconds you automatically draw the conclusion that it proves axial rotation is constant and build concepts on such infantile reasoning. The core principles which clocks in sync with the axial cycle arise directly from the point of view of an orbitally moving Earth for diurnal rotation followed as a principle and still further, the intricate adaption of the average 24 hour to the axial cycles and terrestrial longitudes rely only on appreciating the transfer of the average 24 hour cycle to a 'constant' axial cycle as a

principle rather than a direct observation.

I

Unfortunately Newton is one such case where astronomical insights were bent using an idiosyncratic method to suit conclusions such as terrestrial ballistics applied to structural astronomy. Again, Newton's approach to retrogrades and his conclusion have no astronomical basis and is destructive to the nth degree.

And yet the perturbation theories that let us predict with high accuracy even the complex motions of the Moon rest directly on the Moon moving according to terrestrial ballistics, modified by the gravities of the other bodies in the Solar System, through Newton's law of Universal Gravitation with its inverse square law.

When Newton's system works via the calendrical cycle or rather justifying the axial and orbital motions of the Earth through a 365/366 day system you know straight away that your statement is little more than indoctrination.

That which is productive of correct predictions about nature is the likeliest to be based on a sound understanding of nature as it is, even if the understanding has its limits.

You will predict that a star will return to a location in 23 hours 56 minutes 04 seconds of a 24 hour day and then draw the conclusion that axial rotation is constant. You have established this in your mind, as part of the Flamsteed/Newton framework that you would become ill if you had to imagine otherwise and it is otherwise.

This is an injustice like no other, an astrological framework overlaid on heliocentric reasoning and even with actual contemporary imaging

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

that clearly demonstrates the reasoning understood by Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, there is not the slightest sign of budging from an ill-considered and worthless view of Newton –

The imaging in no way contradicts Newton, so it applies no force to budge us away from him.

Astronomy is not all about magnification equipment it is more about rediscovering the noble intellects that once graced the astronomical stage and from that point of departure making new discoveries and modifications with modern imaging and techniques.

I do not disagree with this, but it seems as though you have discovered something in your study of those intellects that is not there, which is why no one else sees it – just as too much magnification led Percival Lowell to see canals on Mars.

John Savard

Agree or disagree, none of you appear to be astronomers to begin with even if you don't mind attaching yourselves to the disciplines of Copernicus, Kepler and Galileo. You begin at a level far below the Simplicio character, the trouble is that Galileo had to invent such a character while I meet worse every single day here.

SAGR." I know; such men do not deduce their conclusion from its premises or establish it by reason, but they accommodate (I should have said discommode and distort) the premises and reasons to a conclusion which for them is already established and nailed down. No good can come of dealing with such people, especially to the extent that their company may be not only unpleasant but dangerous."

<http://webexhibits.org/calendars/year-text-Galileo.html>

T

..

.